



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/533,220	04/28/2005	Shoichi Akita	4605-051180	9486
28289 7590 10/16/2009 THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219				
EXAMINER				
GRABOWSKI, KYLE ROBERT				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3725				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/16/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/533,220

Applicant(s)

AKITA, SHOICHI

Examiner

Kyle Grabowski

Art Unit

3725

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11, 15 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11, 15 and 17-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 9-11, 15, and 17, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benim et al. (US 2003/0207059) in view of Varano (US 5,226,585).
4. Benim et al. disclose a label 15 for attachment to a cup 140 (Fig. 6); the label comprises an expanded foam layer 30 (0023) laminated with a non-foam layer 10 of a heat-shrinkable polyester film (0027); the label 15 may be attached to the cup via a hot melt adhesive 26 on its inner side (0035, Fig. 1); the label may be embossed by softening resulting in permanent indentations in the label stock - the softening is optionally created in the thermal insulating foam layer as well (0033) (e.g. the thermal

layer may also be softened thereby causing permanent indentations with the pressing from a roller, it is inferred that at least some face material is propagated into the softened thermal layer, in other words, how else does softening the thermal layer "help the embossing process"); the outer layer 14 of non-foam layer 10 is heat-shrinkable (0026).

5. Although Benim et al. discloses an embossing the surface of the label, but does not specify them as linear depressions, particularly linear depressions having a width of 0.5-3.0 mm however Varano teaches a label 28, having linear depressions 38, which is wrapped around the outer surface of a cup (Fig. 5) wherein the widths of each linear depression 38 is approximately 0.030 inches (0.76 mm) (Col. 4, 37-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the linear depressions taught in Sterrett with a width of approximately 0.76 mm in view of Varano to provide a convenient gripping surface without detracting from the surface appearance (Varano, Col. 4, 51-55).

6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benim et al. (US 2003/0207059) in view of Varano (US 5,226,585) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Washburn et al. (US 6,303,202). Benim et al. as modified by Varano substantially disclose the claimed subject matter for the reasons stated above including an ink receptive coating (printing layer) 12 for printing (0028, Fig. 1, Benim et al.) but do not disclose the type of ink used thereon however Washburn et al. teach a label printed with UV curable ink (Col. 3, 60-65) and it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the ink on the ink receptive coating taught in Benim et al. as modified by Varano as a UV curable ink, to utilize an ink known in the art and to utilize its waterproof properties (Col. 3, 65, Washburn et al.).

7. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benim et al. (US 2003/0207059) in view of Varano (US 5,226,585) as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Amberg (US 4,018,640). Benim et al. as modified by Varano substantially disclose the claimed subject matter for the reasons stated above including providing the indentations with an embossing roller (0030) but do not disclose providing the indentations in a lattice form however Amberg teaches providing similar indentations as Varano (Fig. 20) in a similar label with an embossing roller (Fig. 18) and alternately providing an embossing roller (Fig. 25) to produce indentations forming a lattice (Fig. 26) and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the linear embossing roller (for the indentations) taught in Benim et al. and Varano with the lattice forming embossing roller in view of Amberg to create a lattice pattern. The claim would have been obvious because the substitution of one known element for another would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Changing the die shapes of an embossing roller to alter embossed patterns yields predictable results.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-11, 15, and 17-19, have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. A similar patent also by Benim et al. '059 specifies that the embossing may take place after lamination (as opposed to before as cited in the other patent).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle Grabowski whose telephone number is (571)270-3518. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dana Ross can be reached on (571)272-4480. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle Grabowski/
Examiner, Art Unit 3725

/Dana Ross/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3725